VOL. XXII. N° 88, OCTOBER 1907

THE ENGLISH HISTORICAL REVIEW

EDITED BY

REGINALD L. POOLE, M.A., PH.D.

FELLOW OF MAGDALEN COLLEGE AND LECTURER IN DIPLOMATIC IN THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD

CONTENTS

Articles PAGE

Tartars and Chinese before the Time of Confucius. By Professor E. H. Parker . . . 625

Knight-Service in Normandy in the Eleventh Century. By Professor Haskins . . . 636

The Coronation of Queen Elizabeth. By C. G. Bayne, C.S.I. . . . 650

The Capture of New Amsterdam. By Professor Schoolcraft . . . 674

The Northern Pacification of 1719-20. By J. F. Chance. Part II. The Swedish Treaties . . . 694

Notes and Documents

Caesar's Crossing of the Thames. By F. H. Baring . . . 726

The Wareham Inscriptions. By the Rev. Edmund McClure . . . 728

William fitz Aldelin. By the Rev. James Wilson . . . 730

The Amercement of Barons by their Peers. By L. W. Vernon Harcourt . . . 732

Some Letters of Masters and Scholars, 1500-1530. By P. S. Allen . . . 740

A Note on the Export Trade of Ireland in 1641, 1665, and 1669. By R. Dunlop . . . 754

Chatham and the Representation of the Colonies in the Imperial Parliament. By Basil Williams . . . 756

Moritz Broech. By the Master of Peterhouse, Cambridge . . . 758

Reviews of Books (see List on next page) . . . 761

Short Notices (see List on next page) . . . 820

Index . . . 835

TO BE CONTINUED QUARTERLY

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.

39 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON

NEW YORK, BOMBAY, AND CALCUTTA

... per number, or 22/- per year post free

All Rights Reserved

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

PAGE

Sayce and Cowley, *Aramaic Papyri discovered at Assuan*: by S. A. Cook . . . 761

Ferrero, *The Greatness and Decline of Rome* (Engl. tr.): by H. Stuart Jones . . . 763

Gefficken, *Zwei Griechische Apologeten*: by P. V. M. Benecke . . . 766

Harnack, *Der Brief des Britischen Königs Lucius an den Papst Eleutherus*: by A. H. Mathew 767

Procopius, *Opera Omnia*, ed. by J. Haury, iii, 1: by Professor Bury, LL.D. . . . 770

Principe di Teano, *Annali dell' Islam*, ii, 1: by G. le Strange . . . 772

Duprèel, *Histoire critique de Godefroid le Barbu, duc de Lotharingie, Marquis de Toscane*: by F. M. Powicke . . . 773

Duvernoy, *Le Duc de Lorraine, Mathieu I* [1139-1176]: by F. M. Powicke . . . 773

Vernon Harcourt, *His Grace the Steward and Trial of Peers*: by J. H. Round, LL.D. . 778

Hudson, *The Records of the City of Norwich*, i: by Professor J. Tait . . . 782

Thomas de Celano's *S. Francisci Assisiensis Vita et Miracula*, ed. by E. d'Alençon: by A. G. Little . . . 784

Lodewijk van Velthem, *Voortzetting van den Spiegel Historiael* [1248-1316], i: by Professor Tout . . . 786

Sir Thomas Gray, *Scalacronica* (Engl. tr.): by Professor Tout . . . 787

Registrum Ade de Orleton Episcopi Herefordensis: by Miss H. Johnstone . . . 788

Registres du Conseil de Genève, ii [1461-1477]: by the Rev. W. A. B. Coolidge . . . 791

Rott, *Histoire de la Représentation Diplomatique de la France auprès des Cantons Suisses*, iii, 1: by the Rev. W. A. B. Coolidge . . . 791

Cambridge University Grace Book B., edited by Mary Bateson: by the Rev. H. Rashdall, D.Litt. . . . 792

Antonio de Beatis, *Die Reise des Kardinals Luigi d'Aragona*: by E. Armstrong . . . 793

Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII, xix, 1, 2: by Professor A. F. Pollard . . . 795

Millar, *George Buchanan*: by W. Murison . . . 797

Neilson, *George Buchanan*: by W. Murison . . . 797

Calendar of Venetian State Papers [1607-1615]: by Professor Firth, LL.D. . . . 801

Osgood, *The American Colonies in the Seventeenth Century*: by Professor Egerton . . . 804

The Cambridge Modern History, iv; *The Thirty Years' War*: by W. E. Rhodes . . . 807

Bastide, *John Locke, ses théories politiques et leur influence en Angleterre*: by P. V. M. Benecke 808

Rousseau, *Règne de Charles III d'Espagne*: by the Rev. W. H. Hutton . . . 809

Hunt, *The Irish Parliament, 1775*: by C. Litton Falkiner . . . 811

Bonnefons, *Marie-Caroline, Reine des deux Siciles*: by H. C. Gutteridge . . . 812

Desormeaux, *Kléber en Vendée* [1793-1794]: by Colonel E. M. Lloyd, R.E. . . . 814

Dejean, *Un Préfet du Consulat, Jacques-Claude Beugnot*: by Professor Mordaque . . . 815

Trevelyan, *Garibaldi's Defence of the Roman Republic*: by W. Miller . . . 816

Hanotaux, *Contemporary France*, iii (Engl. tr.): by P. F. Willert . . . 817

SHORT NOTICES

Williams' *History of the Art of Writing* . . . 820

Robinson, *Ancient Sluices* . . . 821

Arriani *Opera*, i: *Alexandri Anabasis* . . . 821

Witkowski, *Epistulae Privatae Graecae* . . . 822

Oehler, *Bilder-Atlas zu Cäsars Büchern de Bello Gallico* (2nd ed.) . . . 822

Josephus (Whiston's translation), ed. by Margoliouth . . . 822

Abbott, *Israel in Europe* . . . 823

Philologicheskie etiudy i zamietki (Niezhin), xxiii 2, vi . . . 823

Leo, *Die Entwicklung des ältesten japanischen Seelenlebens* . . . 824

Mrs. Gordon, *St. George* . . . 825

Paul the Deacon, *History of the Langobards* (Engl. tr.) . . . 826

Round, *The Chronology of Henry II's Charters* 826

Hodgson, *Jung Heinrich, König von England, Sohn König Heinrichs II* . . . 826

Pike, *The Public Records and the Constitution* 827

Clarke, *The Chronicle of Jocelin of Brakelond* (revised ed.) . . . 827

Close Rolls of the Reign of Henry III, ii . . . 827

Calendar of the Patent Rolls, Henry III [1232-1247] . . . 828

Sotbelli, *Il Trattato di S. Vincenzo Ferrer intorno al Grande Scisma d'Occidente* (new ed.) 828

Ambrosoli, *Atlante numismatico Italiano* (*Monete moderne*) . . . 829

Chambers, *Notes on the History of the Revels Office under the Tudors* . . . 829

Malagrin, *Histoire de la Tolérance religieuse* . 830

Zeitschrift des Historischen Vereins für Niedersachsen, 1907, 3 . . . 830

Guyot, *Le Poète J. F. Regnard* . . . 831

Calendar of the Correspondence of George Washington, i . . . 831

Gendry, *Pie VI, sa vie, son pontificat* . . . 831

Davis, *History of the Second (Queen's) Regiment, now the Queen's (Royal West Surrey) Regiment*, v, vi . . . 832

Besant, *Medieval London*, ii . . . 832

Kennedy, *The Manor and Parish Church of Hampstead* . . . 833

Beck, *Memorials to serve for the History of the Parish of St. Mary, Rotherh...* . . . 834

Gilbert, *Trade and Currency i...* . . . 834

Jacobstein, *The Tobacco I... States* . . . 834

The Coronation of Queen Elizabeth.

QUEEN ELIZABETH was crowned in Westminster Abbey on 15 January 1559. The coronation was a notable event for two reasons—first because it was the last coronation that took place in England with the Latin service of Plantagenet times, and secondly because the order of the ceremony at particular points throws light on the religious opinions which Elizabeth held, or professed to hold, at the beginning of her reign. The interest of the subject is increased by the fact that contemporary evidence of what happened is both scanty and conflicting; the student who turns his attention to it must begin by dissecting the evidence and determining which of the two main accounts is the more credible. When he has arrived at a conclusion on this point he will find that the facts which he has sifted out afford some help towards the solution of the question which has vexed, and still vexes, historians—What were Elizabeth's intentions and beliefs in matters of religion when she ascended the throne?

The coronation of an English king in Tudor times was a magnificent and elaborate ceremony, consisting of a procession from the Tower to Westminster on the eve of the coronation day, a procession from Westminster Hall to the Abbey on the following morning, the coronation itself in the Abbey, and the banquet and other festivities which brought the proceedings to a close. This article is concerned with the coronation, which was the central solemnity, and more particularly with the mass which came at the end of the service in the Abbey. It is the course of events at the coronation mass that furnishes the most striking illustration of Elizabeth's attitude to the religious question at the beginning of her reign.

I. *The Authorities.*

The authentic contemporary documents describing the coronation of Queen Elizabeth are remarkably few. They consist of—

1. A narrative by an unknown English spectator. One copy of this narrative is in the Bodleian library (Ashmole's collection), another is at the Record Office (S.P., Dom., Eliz., Addenda, vol. ix. no. 9). The original is not forthcoming. Both the narrative in

the Bodleian and that in the Record Office purport to be copies from an original 'in Mr. Anthony Anthony's collection.' The narrative has often been reprinted.[1]

2. A report by Il Schifanoya, an Italian resident in London, which is printed on pp. 16 and 17 of the *Venetian Calendar*, vol. vii.

3. A fragment of a few sentences in the College of Arms[2] which is bound up in a volume entitled 'W Y' with a number of manuscript reports of royal functions. The only part of the volume which relates to Elizabeth's coronation consists of the page containing this fragment and the page which immediately precedes it (p. 197), both written in the same hand. The page which precedes the fragment is headed 'The copie of ye Proclamation of Queene Elizabeth made by ye Heraulds after ye death of Queen Mary truly extracted out of an ould copie therof remayning in the office of Armes. May 1626 by me Yorke.' This page contains copies of two proclamations, one announcing Elizabeth's accession and the other inviting claimants to present claims to do service at her coronation. Then follows the page containing the fragment about the coronation.

These three documents, together with two lines in a letter[3] from the Spanish ambassador De Feria, are the only contemporary accounts that exist of the actual coronation. For convenience of reference they are printed at the end of this article, being broken up into paragraphs in order to indicate the various stages of the ceremony. I refer to them hereafter as the English, Italian, and herald's reports. I have added illustrative footnotes.

Besides these narratives a few documents have survived which give a certain amount of indirect information. These are—

1. A document entitled 'Articles concerning the Queen's Coronation' containing memoranda on points connected with the ceremony. The document is among the Harleian MSS. in the British Museum (no. 6064, p. 4). A copy is in the Record Office (S.P., Dom., Eliz., vol. i. no. 51). It is not dated, but from internal evidence it must have been drawn up before 18 December 1558.

2. A folio volume of 147 pages among the lord chamberlain's records at the Record Office (*Lord Chamberlain's List*, 1887, vol. 3), entitled on the cover 'The presidente of the coronacon of our Sovereyne lady Quene Elysabethe Solemnyzed at Westminster the XV^th^ Day of January in the ffirst yer of Hir most prosperous Reyne. Anno Dñi 1558.' On the first page is a statement that

[1] E.g. in Nichols's *Progresses of Queen Elizabeth*, i. 61.

[2] My acknowledgments are due to the chapter of the College of Arms for permission to copy this document; also to Mr. Lindsay, K.C., Windsor herald, for kindly helping me to trace it.

[3] *Spanish Calendar*, i. 25. I quote these later on.

the book contains Sir Richard Sackville's[4] 'accompte' of all sums received by him for the coronation, of articles bought for the same purpose, and of materials issued from the great wardrobe. Then follow the accounts in great detail, together with lists of officers of state, members of the household, and servants of the court. The book ends with a list of ladies appointed to attend on the queen. I refer to this volume hereafter as 'Coronation Accounts.'

3. Two entries in another volume among the lord chamberlain's records (vol. 792) containing various documents connected with the great wardrobe of a very miscellaneous character. The entries relating to Elizabeth's coronation are—

(*a*) A summary of the articles provided for her coronation (p. 253). This adds a little to the information furnished by the Coronation Accounts.

(*b*) Four pages giving 'the order of proceeding from the Towre to the Palace of Westminster, the even of the coronacon of our souverayne lady quene Elizabeth' (p. 164), and 'the proceeding to the Abbey for the coronacon' (p. 166).

II. *Examination of the Authorities.*

Of the three reports of the coronation which are printed at the end of this article the English report, till a few years ago, was the only source from which historians drew their narratives. Recent writers however have preferred to base their accounts on the Italian report, which was not accessible to their predecessors. Dr. Dixon's account[5] of the ceremony is drawn entirely from this source; the late Professor Maitland, in the *Cambridge Modern History*,[6] relies, in part, on the same authority; Mr. Frere, in his *History of the English Church*, refers[7] to both reports, but he regards the Italian report as the more credible. The English report seems to have become discredited. Neither Maskell nor Mr. L. G. Wickham Legg, with their wealth of references[8] to coronations of all epochs from the sixth century to the present day, has thought it

[4] Sir Richard Sackville had charge of all the arrangements at Elizabeth's coronation (Harleian MS. 6064, no. 4).

[5] *History of the Church of England*, v. 49, 50.

[6] Vol. ii. p. 565. He writes, 'What happened at the coronation is obscure. The bishops, it seems, swore fealty in the accustomed manner; the epistle and gospel were read in English; it is said that the celebrant was one of the queen's chaplains, and that he did not elevate the Host; it is said that she did not communicate.'

[7] P. 11: 'The coronation mass was said in Latin, with the epistle and gospel read in English as well as Latin; and of two contrary reports that one is more probably true which states that the elevation was omitted and the celebrant was George Carew, dean of the Chapel Royal.'

[8] See the dissertations prefixed to Mr. Legg's *English Coronation Records*, 1901, and to vol. ii. of Maskell's *Monumenta Ritualia*, 1882.

worthy of notice. *Prima facie* it is not clear why a report which purports to be a contemporary narrative by an English spectator should be pushed aside by the report of a foreigner. I therefore propose, in the first place, to examine the English and Italian reports with a view to testing their respective credibility. In such an examination the following questions suggest themselves: Do the two narratives confirm or contradict each other, and, if they contradict each other, which of the two is the more accurate? The first question is easily answered. The reports contradict each other. The Italian report states that the mass began early in the ceremony and that the coronation took place nearly half-way through the mass; the English report that the whole ceremony of coronation came first and that the mass was celebrated after it had been finished. According to the Italian the mass was sung by the dean of the Chapel Royal, because the bishops refused to officiate; according to the Englishman the mass was sung by a bishop. The Italian states that the Host was neither consecrated nor elevated, the Englishman that Elizabeth withdrew at the consecration, thus implying that consecration and elevation took place. These contradictions cannot be reconciled. Either the English report or the Italian report is incorrect. We thus come to the question of their respective accuracy. So far as external evidence goes the Italian report, though written by a foreigner, is to be preferred. We know when and by whom it was written. It is strictly contemporary, written at the time by a man who was on the spot. Of the English report nothing is known. It is simply a narrative without date or name of author which in the seventeenth century formed part of the manuscript collections of a Mr. Anthony Anthony.

But when we appeal to internal evidence we feel inclined to pin our faith on the Englishman. His report contains a detailed account of the solemnity, which has all the appearance of an eye-witness's narrative. The Italian report, on the other hand, is a brief summary, in which a few items are singled out for description. It seems worth while to seek for some standard by which we can test the accuracy of both reports. Such a standard is provided by the *Liber Regalis*,[9] a coronation service book which was used at coronations from 1307 to 1661.[10] I propose to test the accuracy of our two narratives by comparing them with the *Liber Regalis*. The ceremony[11] consisted of the following parts:—

1. *The Recognition.*—The king enters Westminster Abbey and advances to a seat near the altar. He is here exhibited by the archbishop to the people, who are asked whether they accept him as king, and reply with shouts of acclamation.

[9] *Engl. Coron. Rec.* p. 81.

[10] *Ibid.* pp. xv and xix of 'Introduction.'

[11] See *Liber Regalis*, passim.

2. *The First Offering.*—The king is led to the high altar, where he makes an offering of a pall and a pound of gold.

3. *The Sermon.*—A sermon is preached by a bishop.

4. *The Oath.*—The archbishop administers the oath.

5. *The Consecration of the King.*—The king lies prostrate before the altar while prayers and psalms are said over him.

6. *The Anointing.*—The king is anointed.

7. *The Investiture with the Ornaments and Insignia.*—The archbishop blesses the ornaments and insignia one by one, and the king is invested with them in turn. They consist of the long tunic, buskins, sandals, spurs, girdle, sword, armils, mantle, crown, ring, gloves, sceptre, and rod.

8. *The Homaging.*—The king is led to his throne, which is placed on a stage at the junction of the transept and the choir, and the bishops and peers do homage.

9. *The Mass.*—The mass is celebrated.

10. *The Revesting.*—The king is taken to St. Edward's Chapel, divested of his robes and ornaments and revested with others. He then leaves the Abbey and the ceremony ends.

This summary is sufficient to show that the coronation service was long and complicated, consisting of prayers, psalms, and chants, interspersed with ritual observances of a very elaborate kind. Any report of a coronation which follows the ceremonies step by step, giving them in correct order, must either have been written by an eye-witness or from the notes of an eye-witness. Now the English report is such a report. It records the ceremonies of the coronation in a bald, almost illiterate narrative, beginning with Elizabeth's entry into the Abbey and ending with her departure from it. On comparing it with the *Liber Regalis* we find it quite accurate as regards sequence of events; it describes each distinct stage of the solemnity in the order in which the *Liber Regalis* tells us that it took place. The writer was probably a layman, since he slurs over the devotional parts of the ceremony, being obviously more interested in what was done than in what was said—in the recognition, the oath, the delivery of the regalia, and so on, than in the devotional exercises in which the ceremonial was embedded. His narrative contains mistakes and omissions, and his account of the administration of the oath is hopelessly confused, but nevertheless the general impression conveyed is that the narrative is what it purports to be, an account written down immediately after the event by a man who himself saw what he reports. This impression is confirmed by several expressions and turns of language which would hardly have occurred to anyone but a spectator. These are as follows:—

1. Among the vestments with which the king is endued after he has been anointed is the 'armill.' The 'armill' was a vestment

shaped like a stole,[12] woven of gold and set with precious stones, which was thrown over the king's neck and hung down to his elbows, to which it was fastened with silken laces above and beneath each elbow. The English report describes Elizabeth's investment with the armill as follows: 'and after that two garters upon her hands.'[13]

2. The English report mentions the following ceremonial as occurring during the celebration of the mass: 'And immediately after her Matie went to the offering. And before her Grace was borne iii naked swords, and a sword in the scabbard.' The *Liber Regalis* makes no mention of the carriage of swords at this stage, but we know from the 'Little Device,'[14] or programme, for the coronation of Henry VII that the ceremonial was usual at Tudor coronations.

3. At that point of the ceremony which immediately precedes the anointing the English report contains the following passage: 'And the Bishop sang the [*blank in manuscript*] of the Masse in a Book which was brought in before the Queene.' In this mutilated passage the writer evidently refers to that part of the ordinary service of the mass which is technically called the *Sursum corda* and immediately precedes the canon. Hearing[15] words which were familiar to him as part of the mass he described what he heard by reference to the mass.[16]

4. After mentioning that a sermon was preached the English report adds, 'And after the sermon done the byshop bade the bedes her grace voyd out of the chayre knelyinge and said the Lordes Prayer.' I have not found a reference to a bidding prayer in any other report of a coronation. There is no reason to doubt however that the prayer was used when Elizabeth was crowned. The bidding of the bedes,[17] either with or without a sermon, was

[12] Cf. the 'Little Device' of Henry VII (*Engl. Coron. Rec.* p. 233) and Henry VIII (Cott. MS. Tib. E. viii.)

[13] Mr. H. A. Wilson (*Journal of Theological Studies*, ii. 494) thinks that the word 'garters' is used to describe the bracelets and not the armill. It is immaterial to my argument whether the ornament was the armill, or the bracelets, but I think it more probable that it was the armill because it comes at the exact point at which the *Liber Regalis* places it, viz. immediately after the girding on of the sword.

[14] *Engl. Coron. Rec.* p. 236. Cf. also the 'Device' for Henry VIII's coronation, which repeats this prescription (Cotton MS. Tib. E. viii.)

[15] The words are, 'per omnia secula seculorum Amen. Dominus vobiscum. Et cum spiritu tuo. Sursum corda. Habemus ad dominum. Gracias agamus domino deo nostro. Dignum et iustum est. Vere dignum et iustum est equum et salutare nos tibi semper et ubique gracias agere domine sancte pater omnipotens eterne Deus.'

[16] Cf. *Journal of Theological Studies*, ii. 497.

[17] See *The Lay Folks' Mass Book* (Early English Text Society, 1879), by Canon Simmons: 'The bidding prayers (as suggested by the name) are not so much a form of prayer as a bidding of the bedes or prayers of the people, calling aloud upon them to pray, and directing them what to pray for, or, as in after times, calling upon them to use certain specified devotions, with a required intention—paternosters, and after-

an old-established practice in England, reaching back into the earliest times. The reference to them in the English report is interesting, because they were among the few prayers which were said in English before as well as after the Reformation. This fact explains why our reporter mentions them by name alone among the many prayers which he heard in the course of the coronation. They attracted his attention because they were said in English in the midst of a service in which all the other devotions were said or sung in Latin.[18]

For the reasons which I have stated above we may accept the English report as the production of an eye-witness. While it emerges successful from a comparison with the *Liber Regalis*, the narrative in the *Venetian Calendar* is unable to sustain the test. The writer begins with a few words about the ceremony in Westminster Hall, mentions, incorrectly, that the pax was delivered to Elizabeth there, and goes on to describe the procession to the Abbey. He gives the order of the procession wrong, and is more often wrong than right in his identification of the various noblemen who carried swords and regalia.[19] When he comes to the ceremony in the Abbey he states, correctly, that it began with the recognition, and he goes on to say that the mass followed, that the coronation took place after the epistle, and that on the conclusion of the coronation the mass was completed. The inaccuracy of this report appears from the summary of the service which I have given above. So far from coming almost at the beginning of the programme the mass concluded the whole proceeding; a number of elaborate ceremonies, which must have lasted several hours, intervened between it and the 'recognition.' It is difficult to believe that such a misleading account could have been written by a spectator. It may be objected that the Italian uses the word mass in a loose way to refer to the whole solemnity,[20] which might easily be called a mass, since the rite of unction imparted sacramental grace. This explanation is not admissible however, because the references to the epistle and gospel and to elevation and consecration make it clear that when he talks of the mass he means the

wards paternosters and aves, or aves only.' Cf. also *Forms of Bidding Prayer*, Oxford, 1840, by H. O. Coxe.

[18] It will be noticed that the reporter places the bidding prayer after, instead of before, the sermon. This was the ancient practice, which had long become obsolete. Unless our reporter has misplaced it through carelessness its position after the sermon is a curious illustration of the antiquity of the coronation service. Just as the coronation mass contained two items of ceremonial, the offering of bread and wine and the kissing of the gospel, which were of general observance in the early ages of the church, but had long become obsolete, so the placing of the bidding prayer after, instead of before, the sermon was another survival from remote antiquity (*Lay Folks' Mass Book*, pp. 221, 232).

[19] See footnotes on p. 672, below.

[20] Machyn uses the word 'mass' in this sense (*Diary*, p. 187).

mass proper. It is impossible to avoid the impression that his report is based on secondhand, inaccurate information.

III. *The Coronation Mass.*

I now come to the points to which I wish to draw more particular attention, the manner of celebrating the mass at Elizabeth's coronation and her conduct at that part of the service. For purposes of comparison I print the three reports side by side, placing the English report first, because it is the fullest.

English Report.	*Herald's Report.*	*Italian Report.*
1. And after that the bishop began the mass, the queen's majesty having the sceptre in the right hand and the world in the left hand	1. Then ye mass began by ye dean, she still sitting	1. Then the choristers commenced the mass, which was sung by the dean of her chapel, her chaplain, the bishops not having chosen to say mass without elevating the host or consecrating it, as that worthy individual did
2. the epistle read first in Latin		
3. and after that in English		
4. and after that the bishop brought[21] her grace the gospel, which also was read first in Latin and after in English		3. 4. The epistle and gospel being recited in English
5. and she kissed[21] the words of the gospel		
6. and immediately after her majesty went[22] to the offering, and before her grace was borne iii naked swords and a sword in the scabbard	6. till ye offering	
7. and her grace kneeling before the altar, and kissed the paten and offered[23] certain money into the basin	7. she went and kissed ye patent	
8. and then and there was read[24] to her grace certain words	8. and had a collect said over her	
9. and then her grace returned into her closet, bearing the consecration of the mass	9. and went to her traverse, and ye mass proceeds	

[21] See the 'Liber Regalis,' *Engl. Coron. Rec.* p. 103. The kissing of the gospel was part of the prescribed ritual.

[22] *Ibid.* The offering also was part of the ritual.

[23] Cf. the 'Liber Regalis,' *Engl. Coron. Rec.* pp. 103, 104. The offering consisted of bread and wine and a mark of gold. It will be noticed that the report does not mention an offering of bread and wine. They are mentioned in the reports of the coronations of Edward VI (Leland, *Collectanea*, 1774, iv. 327) and Mary (MS. College of Arms, no. I 7, p. 72).

[24] Cf. 'Liber Regalis,' *Engl. Coron. Rec.* p. 104: 'Capite regis ante altare paululum inclinato dicat pontifex qui celebrat missam orationes sequentes.' Then follow two prayers, and then the rubric, 'His orationibus finitis reducantur ad sedes suas.'

English Report.	*Herald's Report.*	*Italian Report.*
10. and her grace kissed the pax [25]		
11. and when the mass was done her grace removed behind the high altar, and then and there her majesty changed her apparel	11. and ended ye queen went into St. Edward's Chapel to shift her	11. The mass and all the ceremonies being concluded, and the queen having twice changed her apparel, they returned into Westminster Hall

A glance at the several reports printed above shows that the English report is much the fullest. It gives the order of the service correctly, mentioning eleven distinct items, while the herald's report mentions six and the Italian only three. The two items which possess most interest for the historical student are the first and the ninth, since they provide materials for an answer to the question, Did irregularities occur at Elizabeth's mass, or was it performed according to the correct Roman (or rather Sarum) ritual? On this point there is a remarkable contradiction in the reports. The herald's report and the Italian report agree in saying that the mass was sung (or begun) by the dean, while the English report says that it was begun by the bishop; the herald's report and the English report agree in saying that Elizabeth withdrew at the consecration, implying thereby that the ceremonies of elevation and consecration were performed, while the Italian report asserts that there was no elevation or consecration.[26] We may feel reasonably certain that the three reports emanate from three independent sources, and consequently when two of them agree as to a particular incident we have very strong evidence that that incident really occurred. At first sight, therefore, we are inclined to assume, as facts which are conclusively proved, first, that the mass was sung by the dean, and secondly, that Elizabeth withdrew at the consecration. But a little consideration shows that these two facts are inconsistent. If the dean sang the mass why should Elizabeth withdraw? Her only possible motive for withdrawing was repugnance to the ceremony of elevation. But if the dean sang the mass it is hardly conceivable that he should have insisted on performing

[25] Cf. 'Liber Regalis,' *Engl. Coron. Rec.* p. 105. The pax was 'a plate with a figure of Christ on the cross stamped on it, kissed first by the priest, then by the clerics and congregation' (*Catholic Dictionary*, 1897, p. 542).

[26] When the Italian says that there was no consecration it is not necessary to assume that he means no consecration of any kind. What he probably means is that there was no valid consecration, no consecration worth the name. It was a common charge against the Reformers that their consecration was no consecration. The speeches of Scot and Feckenham against the Bill of Uniformity (reprinted in Dr. Gee's *Elizabethan Prayer Book*, pp. 228, 236) make the charge, and Scot sums it up by saying that in the consecration the Reformers pass over the words of Christ 'as they were telling a tale or rehearsing a story.' See also the *Parker Correspondence*, p. 65 (Parker Society).

a rite which was distasteful to her. The dean was George Carew,[27] archdeacon of Exeter, a man who had held spiritual preferment under both Edward and Mary, a man, that is to say, of pliable character, who would certainly not have insisted on a ceremonial which his mistress disliked. Indeed, his very appointment as dean shows that he would make no difficulty about complying with her wishes. She would not have deprived Thirlby[28] in order to appoint Carew without first making sure that he would perform the services in the way that she liked. We may therefore feel satisfied that if the dean sang the mass the rite of elevation was omitted. But if the rite of elevation was omitted why should Elizabeth withdraw? This question leads to another: Is it certain that she withdrew? The reports say that she went (or returned) to her traverse (or closet). Do they mean that she withdrew entirely from the service, or merely that she went from the throne, on which she had been sitting, to a traverse, or curtained pew, near the altar? In the sixteenth century the word 'traverse' was used to describe a royal pew or inclosure in church secluded by a curtain. When Elizabeth opened parliament in 1563 she sat in a traverse [29] at the preliminary service in Westminster Abbey. Since it was her practice when she attended church to sit in a special pew, which the language of the day called a traverse, it is an obvious inference that the traverse to which she withdrew during her coronation mass was such a traverse, and that she withdrew to it not from repugnance to any part of the ceremonial but merely because it was her habit to seclude herself in this way during divine service.[30]

For two reasons however this view is untenable. In the first place it is clear that in Tudor times the king heard the coronation

[27] See *Dictionary of National Biography*, ix. 51, and references quoted in the first paragraph. For a fuller account of Carew see B.M. Add. MS. 5811, p. 64r, and Fryth's 'List of the Deans of Windsor' (Ashmole's *Antiquities of Berkshire*, iii. 231). Carew was a noted pluralist, holding at the same time the deaneries of Windsor (collated 1560) and Bristol (collated 1559), as well as other preferments. Fryth accuses him of dilapidating the deanery of Windsor in such a shameless way that the visitor, Lord Keeper Bacon, had to interfere.

[28] *Spanish Calendar*, p. 6.

[29] 'The order of the procedinge of the parliamente one the v^th yere of our souveraigne lady quene Elizabeth'

[*procession*].

'And in this order her highness proceeded to the cathedral churche of Westminster and there at the north dore alyghted where was delivered to her highnes ye Scepter The deane with all the reste of the Clarkes standying on eche syde within the cherche in there copes Thus her highnes there under a canapy borne by the knightes her Scepter in her hand and Trayne borne by the Lord Chamblen assysted by the vischambn proceded upe in to the Chancell and there was placed within her travers on ye south side therof and so proceded to the servyce' (D'Ewes 'Collections,' Harleian MS. 158, p. 127). For other instances of Elizabeth's use of a traverse see Nichols's *Progresses*, i. 158, 159, 199, 209.

[30] The use of a traverse was not peculiar to Elizabeth. Henry VII is mentioned as using one at mass (Leland, *Collectanea*, iv. 245).

mass seated on his throne, merely descending to the altar to make his offering and to receive the sacrament. This ritual is prescribed explicitly in the 'Devices' for the coronation of Henry VII [31] and Henry VIII,[32] and it was observed at the coronations of Elizabeth [33] of York (Henry VII's queen), Anne Boleyn,[34] Edward VI,[35] and Mary.[36] Elizabeth's withdrawal to a traverse after the offering was a divergence from contemporary ritual which in a solemnity where the prescribed order was scrupulously observed cannot have taken place without grave reason. In the second place, at coronations the word traverse had a special meaning, viz. the dressing-room to which the king withdrew to change his vestments.[37] The word occurs repeatedly in reports of coronations during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and always, so far as I have found, in this sense.

In order that the meaning of Elizabeth's action in withdrawing may be fully understood one point remains to be made clear, viz. the situation of the traverse. The English report refers to it as behind [38] the altar, while the herald's report says at one place that she went to her traverse, and almost immediately after that she went into St. Edward's Chapel 'to shift her.' Again, the report of Mary's coronation when it first mentions her traverse describes it as 'beinge on the lyft hande of the high aulter.' [39] It looks as if Mary and Elizabeth had two traverses, one beside the high altar and the other in St. Edward's Chapel. This inference is negatived however by the final reference to the traverse in Mary's report,[40]

rd [i.e. received] of her all the regalles and delyvered them to the deane of Westminster to be laid upon the aulter.' The word 'aforesaid' implies that only one traverse was used at Mary's coronation. A reference to the 'Little Device' of Henry VII enables us to locate this traverse with certainty in St. Edward's Chapel. The ceremony of delivering the ornaments after the mass was performed [41] in St. Edward's Chapel, and Mary's traverse must, accordingly, have been placed there. At Elizabeth's coronation the situation of the traverse was no doubt the same. That she had a traverse in St. Edward's Chapel is proved by the statement in the herald's report that she went there to 'shift her' after the mass, and that this was her only traverse is proved both by the analogy of previous coronations and by the following passage in an almost contemporary. document on coronation ritual: 'A traverse near unto St. Edward's shrine and a closet [42] are to be used for their [the king's and queen's] retiring places when they twice shift their robes in the time of their coronation.'[43] We may, therefore, regard it as certain that the traverse to which Elizabeth withdrew was in St. Edward's Chapel. But St. Edward's Chapel was situated behind the chancel of the main building, and was separated from it by the stone wall (technically called the sanctuary wall) against which the high altar was placed. In order to enter it Elizabeth had to pass through one [44] of the doors which pierce this stone wall on each side of the altar, and by passing through the door she left the chancel of the Abbey and withdrew entirely from the service.

Mary's coronation when it first mentions her traverse describes it as 'beinge on the lyft hande of the high aulter.'[39] It looks as if Mary and Elizabeth had two traverses, one beside the high altar and the other in St. Edward's Chapel. This inference is negatived however by the final reference to the traverse in Mary's report,[40] which is in the following terms: 'Then she was conveyd agayne into her traversse aforesaid and ther the lord great chamblen

[31] *Engl. Coron. Rec.* pp. 235–7.

[32] Cotton MS. Tib. E. viii.

[33] Leland, *Collectanea*, iv. 224.

[34] Hall's *Chronicle* (ed. 1904), ii. 238.

[35] Leland, *Collectanea*, iv. 327. The minutes of the meeting of Edward VI's privy council at which the programme for his coronation was drawn up end with the following sentence: 'Then shall the King be ledde to his travers to heare the High Masse and so departe home crowned in order as he set fourthe accordingly' (*Privy Council Acts*, ii. 33). These words seem to prove that Edward VI, at any rate, heard his coronation mass in a traverse. But they are contradicted by the report of the actual coronation, which states expressly that he heard the mass seated on his throne. It was probably the usual practice for the king to sit in a traverse when he attended mass, and the privy council, who were not experts in coronation ritual, took for granted, when drawing up the programme, that at his coronation he would hear mass in the usual way.

[36] MS. College of Arms, I 7, p. 72. The reports of Edward's and Mary's coronations do not mention their communion, but it is practically certain that Mary, at any rate, communicated.

[37] *Engl. Coron. Rec.* p. 106.

[38] 'When mass was done her grace removed behind the high aulter, and then and there her Matie changed her apparrel.'

[39] MS. College of Arms, I 7, p. 70.

[40] *Ibid.* p. 72.

[illegible] building, and was separated from it by the stone wall (technically called the sanctuary wall) against which the high altar was placed. In order to enter it Elizabeth had to pass through one[44] of the doors which pierce this stone wall on each side of the altar, and by passing through the door she left the chancel of the Abbey and withdrew entirely from the service.

Why did Elizabeth commit this striking breach of the ritual of centuries? Why did she withdraw from the mass when the most solemn part of the service was about to begin? The answer hardly admits of doubt. Her motive for withdrawing was repugnance to the ceremony of elevation.[45] The elevation of the Host, in the eyes

[41] 'And it is to wit that a certain place near the said Shryne [St. Edward's] must be prepared with travers and curtens. . . . And there also the said chamberlayn shall take for [from] the King all the Regalls aforesaid, and peace by peace deliver them to the Abbot of Westminster, the same by him to be Layed upon the said Awlter [of St. Edward's shrine]' (*Engl. Coron. Rec.* p. 237).

[42] The closet was for the queen. The word is used in this sense, and also as synonymous with traverse in the 'Little Device' of Henry VII (*ibid.* p. 238).

[43] This quotation is taken from B.M. Add. MS. 6297, p. 359. The manuscript is entitled 'Precedents &c. of the Officers of Arms;' it is written in a comparatively modern hand, and contains copies of notes on all sorts of heraldic questions interspersed with narratives of royal ceremonies in the sixteenth and first quarter of the seventeenth century. To judge from the context the passage quoted was written in 1625 in connexion with Charles I's coronation.

[44] When a king and queen are crowned the king passes to his traverse through the south door and the queen to her traverse through the north door (*Engl. Coron. Rec.* p. lxii).

[45] The English reporter uses the word 'consecration,' not 'elevation,' but the terms were almost synonymous. Cf. Simmons in the *Lay Folks' Mass Book*, p. 268:

of the sixteenth century, was the visible sign which proclaimed the doctrine of transubstantiation,[46] and we know on the clearest evidence that it was repugnant to Elizabeth. Independent contemporary witnesses tell us that on Christmas Day she ordered the bishop who sang mass to omit elevation, and that on his refusal she withdrew from the service.[47] This incident created

'Sacring is properly the consecration or blessing of the sacramental elements, but from the twelfth century onwards it was so closely connected with the elevation, which men could see—and the words of the canon they could not hear—that it was used in popular language for the elevation of the Host.'

[46] The objections of the catholics to the First Prayer Book of Edward VI in 1548/49 centred upon the omission of elevation and adoration. See Gasquet and Bishop, *Edward VI and the Book of Common Prayer*, pp. 165, 178, 199, 405.

[47] (i) *Fitzwilliams to More.* 'And ffor newes you shall ondyrstand that yestyrdaye beyng Chrystemas day the quene's majestie repayryd to hyr great closet with hyr nobles and ladyes, as hath ben accustomyd yn ssuch high feasts. And she perseving a byschope preparing himselfe to masse all in the olde ffowrme, she tarryd there ontill the gospelle was done, and when all the people lokyd ffor hir to have offryde according the olde ffaccon, she with hyr nobles reeturnyd agayn ffrom the closet and the masse, onto her priveye chamber' (Kempe's *Losely MS.* p. 183).

(ii) *Spanish Calendar*, p. 17: 'On the Sunday of Christmas-tide the queen before going to mass sent for the bishop of Carlisle, who was to officiate, and told him that he need not elevate the host for adoration. The bishop answered that her majesty was mistress of his body and life, but not of his conscience, and accordingly she heard the mass until after the gospel, when she rose and left, so as not to be present at the canon and adoration of the host, which the bishop elevated as usual.'

(iii) *Venetian Calendar*, p. 2: 'On Christmas Day the bishop of Carlisle sang high mass, and her majesty sent to tell him that he was not to elevate the host; to which the good bishop replied that thus had he learnt the mass, and that she must pardon him, as he could not do otherwise; so the gospel being ended, her majesty rose and departed, and on other days it has been so done by her chaplains.'

(iv) Before issuing the bull 'Regnans in Excelsis' (dated 25 February 1570), by which he deprived Elizabeth, Pope Pius V caused an inquiry to be held into her conduct. At this inquiry Daniel, ex-dean of Hereford, deposed as follows: 'Adfueram cum Regina Elizabetha in Sacello esset sub anno 1559 ubi Missam celebrante episcopo Calceonensi dum Cantores gloria in excelsis canebant ipsa unum qui a secretis ei erat ad eumdem episcopum misit, qui praeciperet ne Hostiam elevaret. At episcopus, ut accepi, respondit se iuxta Catholicae ecclesiae consuetudinem, Hostiam elevare velle. Quare Regina antequam evangelium diceretur discessit: et ipse a secretis mihi dixit quod discesserat, ne videret Sacramenti elevationem. Et Decanus, Reginae nomine praecepit mihi, ut die S. Stephani celebrare deberem, sine tamen elevatione. Quod quidem facere recusavi. Quare illa postea sacellanum suum, Minter appellatum, misit qui absque elevatione celebravit; et videbam Reginam quae aderat hunc; quia ego quoque aderam et praefatus Presbyter non elevavit' (*Annales Ecclesiastici*, vol. xxiv., Rome, 1737; quoted by Dixon, v. 15). The 'Minter' referred to at the end of this quotation was probably Winter, one of the queen's chaplains. A list of 'spiritual men without promotion,' which is among the State Papers (Dom., Eliz., vol. iv. no. 38), contains the following entry: 'Chaplains of the queen's majesty:

Mr. Dean,
Mr. Almoner,
Mr. Wynter,
Mr. Yonge,
Mr. Dowman.'

This document, from internal evidence, must belong to a date not earlier than the end of May 1559.

such a stir that it was known in Rome in January[48] and in Germany[49] almost as early.

I have now reached two definite conclusions, first, that Elizabeth withdrew at the consecration, and secondly, that she withdrew because the ceremony of elevation was distasteful to her. A third conclusion is inevitable, that the elevation must have taken place. But, as I have already shown, if the mass was sung by the dean the elevation cannot have been performed. We are thus confronted by two point-blank contradictions, the performance of the solemnity by the dean and the insistence on elevation. From these contradictions there is no issue unless we assume that the mass was sung, not by the dean, but, as the English reporter says, by the bishop. Notwithstanding the concurrence of the herald's and Italian reports I believe that they are mistaken and that the Englishman is right. If the bishop sang the mass the contradictions disappear. The bishop sang the mass with the full ritual, including elevation, and Elizabeth withdrew because the elevation was distasteful to her. The same thing happened as had happened on Christmas Day. On both occasions the officiating bishop was Oglethorpe, on both occasions he celebrated the mass with the full ritual, on both occasions Elizabeth withdrew.

Besides the argument from the probabilities of the case there is an argument of a more direct kind that Elizabeth's coronation mass was celebrated by a bishop in the orthodox way. This argument is derived from the evidence of Daniel at the Roman process of 1570, which I have quoted above.[50] The object of Daniel's evidence was to prove that Elizabeth had committed heretical acts, and therefore he deposed to heretical acts of which he had been eye-witness, the prohibition of elevation on Christmas Day and the celebration without elevation the day after. Now Daniel was the sub-dean of Elizabeth's chapel,[51] and he must have been present at her coronation with the other members of the chapel. If Elizabeth's coronation mass was celebrated in an irregular way surely he would have mentioned it in his evidence. The object of that evidence being to prove her heresy, what more capital instance could he give than the celebration of her coronation mass in an heretical way? The argument from silence is seldom convincing, but having regard to the circumstances in which Daniel gave his

[48] A *diarium pontificum* in the Corsini Library (38 F. 6) contains the following entry: '1559. La Regina d'Inghilterra finalmente di questo mese (gennaro) si dichiara Luterana, e fece un decreto che non si dovesse predicar altro che l'Evangelio e l'Epistola di San Paolo et essendo alla messa non volse stare a veder consecrare anzi volse impedire il vescovo che non consecrasse' (Record Office Transcripts, vol. 69).

[49] Duchess of Suffolk to Cecil, from Crossen, dated 4 March: 'Well,-it is so reported here that her majesty tarried but the gospel, and so departed' (*Foreign Calendar*, p. 160).

[50] P. 662, note 47.

[51] Coronation Accounts, p. 97.

evidence his omission to refer to Elizabeth's coronation mass creates at least a presumption that it was celebrated in the orthodox way.

If it is a fact that a bishop sang the mass, is it possible to explain why both the Italian and the herald's reports assign the office of celebrant to the dean? I believe the answer to be that the dean began the mass by leading the choir when the introit was sung. The rubric in the *Liber Regalis*[52] is as follows:—

Tunc omnibus hiis ita peractis inchoetur officium misse a cantoribus de solempnitate diei, si contigerit dictam fieri coronacionem in festo solempni. Si vero evenerit quod dicta coronacio fiat in simplici die dominico missa de dominica prius a conventu debito more celebrata Incipiatur missa pro rege officium.

Elizabeth was crowned on a simple Sunday, and it may be presumed that the mass began with the office, or introit, 'Protector Noster.' This is what happened at the coronations of Henry VII[53] and Henry VIII,[54] and there is no reason to suppose that a change was made later. We know from the 'Little Device' of Henry VII[55] that the introit was begun by the choir, and we know from Machyn's diary,[56] read with the Italian report,[57] that the choir at Elizabeth's coronation was furnished by the Queen's Chapel.[58] Now the head of the Queen's Chapel was the dean of the Chapel Royal, and it is conceivable that the words of the herald's report, 'then ye masse began by the dean,' merely mean that the dean and the chapel began the introit 'Protector Noster.' The Italian reporter, having heard that the dean began the mass by leading at the introit, jumped to the conclusion that he sang the whole mass and assumed that he omitted the elevation, just as he had omitted it on previous occasions. This explanation seems more probable than the only alternative, that Carew, the dean of Elizabeth's own chapel, the man whom she had selected for this post not two months before, insisted on performing a rite which was so obnoxious to her that she withdrew from the solemnity rather than be present at it.

[52] *Engl. Coron. Rec.* p. 102.

[53] *Ibid.* p. 236.

[54] Cotton MS. Tib. E. viii.

[55] 'All the premisses dewly done, the office of the Masse that beginneth, Protector Noster, shalbe begone of the rulers of the "Quere"' (*Engl. Coron. Rec.* p. 236). Similarly at the coronation of Henry VIII (Cotton MS. Tib. E. viii.) The reports of the coronation of Edward VI and Mary do not mention what chants were used at their coronations.

[56] P. 187: 'Ther mett all the byshoppes, and all the chapell with iii crosses, and in ther copes, the byshops mytered, and syngyng Salve festa dies.'

[57] 'The queen was received [in Westminster Hall], the choristers singing' (*Venet. Cal.* p. 16).

[58] Elizabeth's chapel consisted of the dean, Carew, the sub-dean, Daniel, 5 priests, a paternoster priest, an epistoler, 26 gentlemen of the chapel, the master of the children, 12 children, and 6 men of the vestry (Coronation Accounts, p. 97).

IV. *Elizabeth's Behaviour at the Mass.*

I now come to the detail of the coronation mass. It was high mass with the addition of certain ceremonies peculiar to the occasion. According to the *Liber Regalis*,[59] read with the Sarum missal,[60] the service, at the point to which I wish to call attention, proceeded as follows:—

(1) the gospel,
(2) the presentation of the gospel to the king to kiss,
(3) the king's offering consisting of an oblation of bread and wine and a mark of gold,
(4) two prayers,
(5) the preliminary elevation,[61]
(6) the consecration and the elevations following on the consecration of each of the elements,
(7) the ritual following on consecration,
(8) the Agnus Dei,
(9) the presentation of the pax to the king to kiss,
(10) the communion, including the communion of the king.

The English, read with the herald's report, enables us to follow Elizabeth's proceedings. She remained present during the earlier part of the mass, seated on her throne; after kissing the gospel (2) she came down from her throne and made her offering (3), two prayers were said over her (4), and then, when the preliminary elevation (5) was about to take place, instead of returning to her throne, as the contemporary ritual directed and as Henry VII, Elizabeth of York, Henry VIII, Anne Boleyn, Edward VI, and Mary had done, she withdrew into her traverse in St. Edward's Chapel, where she remained until the consecration and the elevations incidental to consecration (6) were completed. She returned to her throne[62] at some point during stages (7) and (8) of the service, she received the pax (9), and it may be presumed that she remained present until the mass was finished. If she had absented herself again the reports could hardly have failed to mention the fact.

On one point the reports leave us in doubt,—whether Elizabeth communicated or not. Because they are silent it does not follow as of course that she abstained. There can be no doubt that Mary communicated, and yet the official report[63] of her coronation makes

[59] *Engl. Coron. Rec.* p. 103.

[60] Maskell, *Ancient Liturgy*, 1882.

[61] By the English uses (except Hereford) the Host was elevated immediately before as well as after consecration. The preliminary elevation was not authorised by the Roman use (Maskell, *Ancient Liturgy*, p. 134; *Lay Folks' Mass Book*, p. 283, note 2).

[62] The reports do not say this explicitly, but as her four predecessors received the pax seated on the throne Elizabeth probably received it there too.

[63] MS. College of Arms, I 7, p. 72.

no mention of the fact. It records the fact that she received the pax, and then goes straight on to the final ceremony of revesting. Two circumstances however make it probable that Elizabeth did not communicate. The first is that no mention is made of her offering an oblation of bread. The king's offering at the mass consists of a mark of gold, an 'obley' of bread, with which he is afterwards 'houselled,' and a cruet of wine, which is given to him to drink after his communion.[64] Now the English report mentions the offering of money, but not the offering of bread and wine. It is a reasonable inference that no bread or wine was offered. The probability of the inference is increased by the report of De Feria, the Spanish ambassador. Writing on 31 January De Feria says—[65]

By last post [66] I wrote your majesty that I had been told that the queen took the holy sacrament *sub utraque specie* on the day of her coronation, but it was all nonsense. She did not take it at all.

This report is probably correct, for De Feria, having misinformed Philip once, would presumably make sure of his facts before sending a second report. What he writes, taken with the silence of the English narrative, may be regarded as proving that Elizabeth did not communicate.

C. G. Bayne.

I. The English Report.

State Papers, Domestic, Addenda, vol. 9, no. 9. Transcribed from Mr. Anthony Anthony's collection.

First her Grace satt in a chair [67] of Estate in the midde of the Church before the high aulter and immediately her Grace was conducted from
The recognition
the said chaire and led between two Lordes [68] to be proclaymed by a Bishop Quene of England at iiii places and the Trumpettes blowing at every proclamation. And immediately the Quene's Maty. was brought to the Chaire of Estate.

[64] *Engl. Coron. Rec.* p. 236 (for Henry VII); Leland, *Collectanea*, iv. 327 (for Edward VI); MS. College of Arms, I 7, p. 72 (for Mary).

[65] *Span. Cal.* p. 25.

[66] This letter is not extant.

[67] Cf. *Engl. Coron. Rec.* p. xxii. According to the prescribed ritual the king sat in three different chairs at different parts of the ceremony—(1) the chair of estate, (2) St. Edward's chair, (3) the throne. At certain points he knelt at a faldstool. In Elizabeth's coronation accounts three chairs are referred to—(1) 'St. Edwarde's chaire,' (2) the 'siege Royall,' (3) a 'Chayre of Estate' (pp. 17–9). There is no mention of a faldstool.

[68] The earls of Shrewsbury and Pembroke (*Venetian Calendar*, p. 18, and the Lord Chamberlain's Records, vol. 792, p. 167). The office of supporting the king at his coronation belonged to the bishops of Durham and Bath and Wells (*Engl. Coron. Rec.* p. 180). Tunstal and Bourne, the incumbents of the sees at Elizabeth's accession, were absent from her coronation. Tunstal was excused from attending on account of his age and the discomfort of travelling in winter. The draft of the letter which excused him is among the State Papers (Domestic, vol. i. no. 37). It instructs him to nominate three 'mete persons' from whom the queen would choose one to perform his duties at the coronation. The draft had first directed him to nominate three 'of your brethren bishops,' but these words have been crossed out and the direction to nominate three meet persons substituted. Bourne, who was president of the council of Wales, was absent from parliament, presumably on the duties of his office, and it may be assumed that he was absent from the coronation also.

And immediately her Grace was led before the high aulter and there sitting a Bishop the Quene's Matie kneeling before the Bishop and kissed
The first offering
the patyn her Grace offered [69] money and the Bishop layd it in ye Basyne and imediately offerid a part [70] of red silke wherein the paten was covered.

And immediately [71] hir Highness sat in a chaire before the Aulter there being a Bishop [72] in the Pulpit preaching a Sermon before the Queenes
The sermon
Matie. and all the Lordes Spirituall and Temporall. And after the Sermon done the Bishop bade [73] the bedes her Grace voyde out of the chayre kneelyinge and said the Lordes Prayer.

And after that her Grace satt in hir Chayre. And the Bishop gave her a Book which she had taking her oath. And after that the Bishop
The oath
kneeling before the Aulter read in two Bookes; and her Grace gave a little book to a Lord to deliver unto the Bishop. The Bishop returned the book to the Lord, and red other Bookes. And immediately the Bishop took the Queenes booke and read it before the Quene hir grace.[74]

[69] The Coronation Accounts (p. 15) contain the following entry:—

'iii yardes satten Crimsin wroughte with Braunches & workes of golde for one Paule for the Quene to offre at high masse.'

No reference is made to the offering of gold, but the following entry occurs in the summary of the articles provided for Elizabeth's coronation (Lord Chamberlain' Records, vol. 792, p. 225):—

'Crimsen capha [a rich silk cloth] golde bawdkin for a pawle which the Quene doth offre at highe masse . . . iii yerdes
a pece of golde value . . . . . xx *li.*'

It will be noticed that the first and second offerings are confused. The offering at high mass was the second offering, but a pall was not offered then.

[70] 'Part' is no doubt a copyist's error for 'pall.'

[71] According to the 'Liber Regalis' (*Engl. Coron. Rec.* p. 87) the king lies prostrate before the altar after the offering, a short prayer is said, and then the sermon follows. The report of Mary's coronation notes that at this point 'a quission of velvet was layd before the Aulter upon the which her Grace laye prostrat whyle eten [*sic* for 'certain'] orysons was said over her' (MS. College of Arms, I 7, p. 70).

[72] The name of the bishop has not been preserved. He was chosen by the other bishops, as appears from the following entry in the 'Articles Concerning the Queen's Coronation:' 'Item her Matie Spiritualtie to appoint the precher the Daie of the Coronacion.' The preacher at Mary's coronation was the bishop of Chichester, who was specially appointed by Mary (*Privy Council Acts* for 4 September 1553, vol. iv. 339).

[73] See p. 655.

[74] As I have noted at p. 654 I am unable to make anything of this confused account. The 'Articles' contain the following entry: 'Item a copy of the Othe that her Majestie shall take to be sene and perused by her highness. The Bokes remayne with the Abbot of Westminster.' The oath was in the form of questions by the bishop and answers by the queen, and the books referred to in the 'Articles' as remaining with the abbot of Westminster were probably separate copies of the oath.

The consecration preliminary to the anointing

And after that hir Grace kneeled before the Aulter and the Bishop red a booke before her Grace.[75] And immediately her Grace went to shift her apparrel.[76]

And the Bishop sang the . . . . of the Masse in a Booke which was brought in before the Queene. And then and there was a carpet with kussynes of gold spread before the aulter. And Secretary Cycill delivered a Booke to the Bishop and there was a Bishop standing at the left hand of the aulter.[77]

The anointing

And the Queenes Matie being newly apparrelled came before the Aulter and lean'd[78] upon the kussyns, and over her was spread a read silken cloth.[79] And then and there the Bishop annoynted her Grace. And that done changing apparrel her grace retorned and sat in her chayre.[80]

[75] These few words describe a ceremonial of considerable length, during which the 'Veni Creator' and the Litany are sung and several long prayers are said (*Engl. Coron. Rec.* p. 88), the king lying prostrate before the altar.

[76] According to the 'Liber Regalis' (*ibid.* p. 91) the changing of apparel takes place after, and not before, the singing of the sentences which are referred to in the words 'the . . . of the masse.'

[77] It is difficult to identify the item of ceremonial referred to here. I conjecture that these words refer to the taking of the oath and were added as an afterthought. They ought to have come in a few lines earlier, but were inserted here by mistake—perhaps of a copyist.

[78] Cf. *Engl. Coron. Rec.* p. xxxvi. Mr. Legg points out that the later Plantagenets and the Tudors knelt to receive the unction.

[79] The Coronation Accounts (p. 15) contain the following entry:—

'pawles of baudekin { Satten crimsin wroughte with Braunches and workes of gold for one Paule of iii yardes di qrt [three-quarters] in Lengthe and vi breedes to holde over the Queene when she is annoynted. xii yardes sarscinett crimsin for to lyne the same Paule.'

[80] At this point follow several ceremonies which the report omits. These are as follows: Those parts of the king's body which have been anointed are dried with cotton wool (except the head), a coif is placed on the head to protect the holy oil, linen gloves are placed on the hands, the king is vested in the garment called the *colobium sindonis*, the insignia are blessed, the king is indued with the long tunic, buskins, sandals, spurs, and girdle or sword belt, and the sword is blessed. Although the report does not mention these ceremonies they were no doubt performed at Elizabeth's coronation. The Coronation Accounts (pp. 12, 15, 22) record the provision of the following articles:—

'Gloves and Quoyffes { one paire of ffyne gloves knytt with white threede and for one quoyfe of camericke with laces.

A tabberde of white sarscinett { ffyve yardes of white sarscinett for one tabberde to be putt uppon the Quenes Mates gowne when she is annoynted.

Cotton wolle—ffyne cotton wolle which Dried uppe the Oyle after the Quenes majestie was annoynted.

Certen necessarye Parcells had in the Quenes Jewelhouse { . . . . . Saincte Edwardes spurres.' . . . . .

Of these several articles the gloves must have been the gloves put on after the unction, as they are bracketed with the coif. The 'tabberde of white sarscinett' was the *colobium sindonis*, which was shaped like a tabard (*Engl. Coron. Rec.* p. 232). There is no direct evidence that the remaining ceremonies mentioned above were performed,

Investiture with the ornaments

And there was a sword with a girdle put over her and upon one of her shoulders and under the other and soe the sword hanging by her side. And after that two garters[81] upon her handes, and then one Crowne[82] put the Bishop upon her head, and then Trumpetes sounding and the Bishop put a Ring[83] upon her finger and delivered the Scepter[84] in her hand and than after the Bishop sat a Crowne upon her head and the Trumpettes sounding. And after that hir Grace offered the sword, and laid it upon the Aulter[85] and returned,[86] kneeling. And the Bishop reading upon a Booke,[87] and she

but it is improbable that they were omitted. The buskins, sandals, and girdle are mentioned among the regalia which were delivered by Sir Richard Sackville to Dr. Bill in 1559 (*ibid.* p. 243).

[81] See above, p. 655 *n.* 13. After the armill, according to the 'Liber Regalis' (*Engl. Coron. Rec.* p. 95), the king receives the mantle. I have found nothing to show whether Elizabeth was vested with this garment or not.

[82] Only two crownings are mentioned in this report, but Elizabeth was no doubt crowned with three crowns, since the herald's report begins 'was crowned with 3 crowns the trumpets blowing at ech,' and the Coronation Accounts contain the following entry (p. 22):—

'certen necessarye Parcells had in the Quenes Jewelhouse { . . . Three crowns.' . . .

Three crowns were used at the coronations of Edward VI (Leland, *Collectanea*, iv. 326) and Mary (MS. College of Arms, I 7, p. 71).

[83] 'A Ringe' was among the 'Parcells' delivered from the jewel house. The 'Articles concerninge the Quenes Ma^tes Coronacion &c.' contain the following entry: 'Item the Crowne the Circlett and Ringe to be broughte that her highnes may assaie the same.' The circlet referred to in this passage was probably worn by the queen to keep her hair in order before the anointing. Cf. *Engl. Coron. Rec.* pp. 226, 235, and Hall's *Chronicle* (ed. 1904), ii. 238.

[84] According to the prescribed ritual (*Engl. Coron. Rec.* p. 97) the offering and redemption of the sword and the delivery of the gloves come before the delivery of the sceptre. The gloves or glove were presented by the lord of the manor of Worksop, who at the time of Elizabeth's coronation was the earl of Shrewsbury (*ibid.* pp. li, lxxvii). As Shrewsbury took a prominent part in the coronation, being one of the earls who supported Elizabeth, there can be little doubt that the gloves were presented, although our reporter has omitted to mention the fact. Shrewsbury put on Edward VI's 'gantlet' at Edward's coronation (Harleian MS. 3504, p. 242 r).

[85] The offering of the sword at Mary's coronation took place immediately before the crowning. The sword was redeemed by the earl of Arundel (MS. College of Arms, I 7, p. 70 r). The redemption of the sword at Elizabeth's coronation is perhaps referred to in the following passage in the herald's report: 'The Lord Steward carrying ye sword which was . . . [*blank in manuscript*] then he gave it to ye Lord Cobham.' The blank should probably be filled by the word 'redeemed.'

[86] The last ornament delivered to the king is the rod. The report does not mention its delivery to Elizabeth at this point, but it notes later that at the mass Elizabeth had the sceptre in her right hand and the 'world' (*i.e.* orb) in her left, and the herald's report states that she 'had given her the sceptre in her right hand and ye ball in her left hand.' The insignia referred to respectively as the 'sceptre' and the 'ball' were the rod, or sceptre of gold with the dove on the top, and the orb, or rod of gold with the cross on the top. They are described in these terms in the 'Devices' of Henry VII (*Engl. Coron. Rec.* p. 234) and Henry VIII (Cotton MS. Tib. E. viii.)

[87] These words probably describe the blessing which concluded the ceremony of delivering the ornaments (*Engl. Coron. Rec.* p. 98).

having a Scepter [88] and a Crosse in her hand. And after that, hir Grace retorned to the Chayer of Estate.

And then the Bishop put his hand to the Quenes hand and read certaine wordes to her Grace. And then the Lordes went up to her Grace kneeling upon their knees and kissed her Grace. And after the Lordes had done, the Bishops came one after another kneeling and kissing her Grace.[89]

The homaging

And after that the Bishop began the Masse, the Queens Matie haveing the Scepter in the right hand and the world [i.e. orb] in the left hand, the Epistell red first in Latyn, and after that in English. And after that, the Bishop brought her grace the Gospell, which allso was red first in Latyn and after in English, and she kissed the wordes of the Gospell. And immediately after her Matie went to the offering. And before her Grace was borne iii naked swordes, and a sword in the scabbard. And her Grace kneelying before the Aulter and kissed the Patyn, and offered certain money into the Bassyn. And than and there was red to her Grace certaine wordes. And then her Grace retorned into her Clossett hearing the Consecration of the Mass and her Grace kissed the pax.

The mass

[88] The orb.

[89] The homaging at Elizabeth's coronation is of special interest, because it illustrates her attitude to the bishops. According to the prescribed ritual the ceremony was performed as follows (*Engl. Coron. Rec.* p. lv): The archbishops and bishops knelt, and the archbishop of Canterbury did fealty (the term used for the homaging of bishops) in the name of himself and his brethren; he and the other bishops then rose and kissed the king's left cheek. Then followed the homage of the peers. The noticeable point is that the bishops took precedence of the temporal peers (*ibid.* p. lv). This ritual was probably observed at the coronations of Henry VII (*ibid.* p. 234) and Henry VIII (Cotton MS. Tib. E. viii.) At the coronation of Edward VI an important innovation was introduced. The Protector (duke of Somerset) did homage first of all, then the archbishop of Canterbury, and then the peers and bishops, no distinction being made between lords spiritual and lords temporal. They all kneeled down together and the Protector 'declared their homage in general' (Leland, *Coll.* iv. 327). At Mary's coronation, as might be expected, the prescribed order was carefully observed, the bishops doing homage before the temporal peers (MS. College of Arms, I 7, p. 71). Coming now to Elizabeth's coronation, the English report, read with the herald's report, enables us to reconstitute the homaging. The bishop (presumably Oglethorpe) did homage first of all. This part of the ceremony is not mentioned in the herald's report, but the English report is so explicit that it may be accepted as correct. The words 'put his hand to the Quenes hand' describe the distinctive attitude of homage (*Engl. Coron. Rec.* p. lvi). So far Elizabeth followed the prescribed order. But at the next stage she departed from it, since the temporal peers did homage before their spiritual brethren. In this change we see a reversion to the precedent of Edward VI and an indication of hostility to the claims of the church. The statement in the herald's report that the bishops did homage 'their Myter of' is also worthy of notice. I have not found it in the account of any other coronation.

Another small fragment of information illustrating Elizabeth's treatment of the bishops perhaps deserves to be recorded. At Mary's coronation each of the bishops was allowed ten yards of scarlet, presumably for a robe (Lord Chamberlain's Records, vol. 792, pp. 200, 208). When Elizabeth was crowned a similar allowance was made, but only to one bishop, Oglethorpe of Carlisle, the bishop who crowned her (Coronation Accounts, p. 133).

And when Masse was done her Grace removed behind the high Aulter, and than and there her Matie changed her apparrell.

The revesting

And so her Matie was conducted from the Abby to Westminster Hall and there dined.

The conclusion

II. The Herald's Report.

Fragment in College of Arms (MS. WY. p. 197).

Was crowned with S crowns the Trumpets blowing at ech and then she kissed the Aulter and returned and had sayd onto her certein orisons and had given her the Sceptre in her Right hand and the Ball in her left hand and so under the Canopie proceeded to the Throne (the Lord Steward carying the Sword which was . . . . then he gave it the Lord Cobham) whereare shee receyved the homage the Dukes, Marquesses, Earls, Viscounts and Barons kissing her cheeke and one speaking for the whole. Then the Bp which expressed it in the name of the rest, and the other kissed after their Myter of.

Then the masse began by the Deane she siting still till the offering she went and kissed the patent and had a Collect said over her and went to her traverse and the masse proceeds and ended the Queene went into Snt Edwards Chapelle to shift her, then came forth in a Riche Mantell and Sircoate of purple velvet furred with Ermines.

III. The Italian Report.

On Sunday, 15 January, mass was sung for the coronation in Westminster Abbey, which was decorated with the handsomest and most precious tapestries that were ever seen, they having been purchased by Henry VIII, representing on one side the whole of Genesis, and on the other the Acts of the Apostles, from a design by Raffael d'Urbino; and the chambers were hung with the history of Caesar and Pompey. At one of the sides the buffet [90] was prepared with its raised steps, on which were seen 140 gold and silver drinking cups, besides others which were below for the service.

Introductory

The queen was received under the canopy by the archbishop and another bishop, they having previously perfumed her with incense, giving her the holy water [91] and the pax, [92] the choristers singing; then the earl of Rutland [93] followed her

The ceremony in Westminster Hall

[90] In Westminster Hall.

[91] Mary was censed and sprinkled with holy water in Westminster Hall (MS. in College of Arms, I 7, p. 69). It is probable that the same ritual was observed with Elizabeth.

[92] See p. 658, note 25. The giving of the pax was a part of the mass. It cannot have been given to Elizabeth in Westminster Hall.

[93] According to the order of procession given here the queen led the way and was followed by the peers carrying the regalia. This is wrong. According to the prescribed order the procession preceded the king, the lowest in rank heading it and the highest in rank coming immediately before the king. This was the arrangement both at Mary's (MS. College of Arms, I 7, pp. 68 r, 69) and Elizabeth's coronations (Lord Chamberlain's Records, vol. 792, p. 166).

majesty with a plain naked sword without any point,[94] signifying Ireland, which has never been conquered; then came the earl of Exeter[95] with the second sword; the third was borne by Viscount Montagu;[96] the earl of Arundel,[97] having been made lord steward and high constable for that day, carried the fourth sword [of justice] with its gilt scabbard loaded with pearls. The orb was carried by the duke of Norfolk,[98] lord marshal, and in advance were knights clad in the ducal fashion, carrying the three crowns, they being the three kings-at-arms; they bore the three sceptres, with their three crowns of iron, of silver, and of gold on their heads, and in their hands three naked iron swords, signifying the three titles of England, France, and Ireland.[99]

Procession from the Hall to the Abbey

In this way they proceeded to the church, the queen's long train being carried by the duchess of Norfolk,[100] after whom followed the lord chamberlain,[101] upon purple cloth spread on the ground, and as her majesty passed the cloth[102] was cut away by those who could get it. Then followed the duchesses, marchionesses, countesses, &c., dragging their trains after them, going two by two, and being exquisitely dressed, with their coronets[103] on their heads, and so handsome and beautiful that it was a marvellous sight.

[94] The sword without the point was called Curtana (*Engl. Coron. Rec.* p. xxv). There is no authority—at any rate I have found none—for the remark that Curtana represented Ireland. At Elizabeth's coronation Curtana was carried by the earl of Derby, who had carried it at Mary's coronation also. Rutland carried the second sword.

[95] Exeter is no doubt a mistake for Worcester. There was no peer bearing the title of earl of Exeter in Elizabeth's reign. The earl of Worcester carried the third sword at Elizabeth's coronation.

[96] Viscount Montagu did not carry a sword or any other of the regalia. The fourth sword, or sword of estate, was borne by the earl of Westmorland. At Mary's coronation Westmorland carried one of the other swords.

[97] The earl of Arundel bore the rod (sceptre), not a sword. He bore the rod at Mary's coronation also. He is correctly described as lord steward and high constable.

[98] Norfolk bore the crown, not the orb. His grandfather had borne the crown at Mary's coronation. The orb was carried by the marquis of Winchester, lord treasurer, who bore it at Mary's coronation also.

[99] The three kings-of-arms were Garter, Clarencieux, and Norroy. Their insignia of office included, *inter alia*, crowns of gold, silver, or copper gilt. They carried wands of silver gilt, not swords. They did not carry the crowns, i.e. those with which Elizabeth was crowned. They carried nothing, so far as I have been able to discover, signifying the royal titles. (See Jones, *Crowns and Coronations*, 1898, p. 479, and *Notes and Queries*, 7th series, viii. 491.)

[100] The train was carried by the countess of Lennox, who was given the place of honour, it may be presumed, as Elizabeth's first cousin on the Tudor side.

[101] This is correct. The lord chamberlain (Lord Howard of Effingham) helped the countess of Lennox to hold up the train.

[102] This seems to have been the custom at coronations (cf. *Engl. Coron. Rec.* p. xxv, and Leland, *Collectanea*, iv. 223).

[103] According to the prescribed order peeresses held their coronets in their hands till the queen was crowned (*Engl. Coron. Rec.* pp. xlvii, lviii, 333). There is no reason to suppose that this rule was departed from at Elizabeth's coronation. The order of procession does not mention peeresses, but it directs that peers shall carry their coronets in their hands. The report of Mary's coronation especially notes that peers are not to put on their coronets until she is crowned (MS. College of Arms, I 7).

On her majesty's arrival at the church, all the bells in London ringing, she ascended the lofty tribune erected between the high altar and the choir, being thus exhibited to the people, of whom it was asked if they wished her to be their crowned queen; whereupon they all shouted 'Yes;' and the organs, fifes, trumpets, and drums playing, the bells also ringing, it seemed as if the world were come to an end. Descending from the tribune the queen placed herself under her royal canopy.

The recognition

And then the choristers commenced the mass, which was sung by the dean of her chapel, her chaplain, the bishops not having chosen to say mass without elevating the host or consecrating it, as that worthy individual did; the epistle and gospel being recited in English.

Beginning of the mass

After the epistle the bishop of Carlisle commenced the coronation, according to the Roman ceremonial, neither altering nor omitting anything but the outward forms, which were not observed as in Italy, the English having no masters of the ceremonies, except the kings-at-arms, and still less caring about formalities.

The coronation

The mass and all the ceremonies being concluded, and the queen having twice changed her apparel, they returned into Westminster Hall in the same order as the first, except that the clergy and bishops remained in the Abbey, her majesty carrying in her hands the sceptre and orb and the ample royal robe of cloth of gold. She returned very cheerfully, with a most smiling countenance for every one, giving them all a thousand greetings, so that, in my opinion, she exceeded the bounds of gravity and decorum.

End of the mass and coronation